

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 36004/36005/36006

STATE OF IDAHO,)	2009 Unpublished Opinion No. 691
)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	Filed: November 24, 2009
)	
v.)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)	
BROOKE A. LAWRENCE,)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Ronald J. Wilper, District Judge.

Judgments of conviction and concurrent, unified sentences of twelve years, with two years determinate, for one count of grand theft and two counts of forgery, affirmed.

Stephen D. Thompson, Ketchum, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Nicole L. Schafer, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before LANSING, Chief Judge, GUTIERREZ, Judge
and MELANSON, Judge

PER CURIAM

Brooke A. Lawrence was charged in three separate cases that were consolidated for all purposes. Lawrence was charged with four counts of grand theft, two counts of forgery and one count of fraud by computer. Pursuant to a plea agreement, Lawrence pled guilty to one count of grand theft, Idaho Code §§ 18-2403, 18-2407(1)(b), and to two counts of forgery, I.C. § 18-3601, and the remaining charges were dismissed. The district court sentenced Lawrence to three concurrent unified terms of twelve years, with two years determinate for the three counts. Lawrence appeals, contending that the district court abused its discretion by imposing excessive sentences.

Where a sentence is within the statutory limits, it will not be disturbed on appeal absent an abuse of the sentencing court's discretion. *State v. Hedger*, 115 Idaho 598, 604, 768 P.2d 1331, 1337 (1989). We will not conclude on review that the sentencing court abused its discretion unless the sentence is unreasonable under the facts of the case. *State v. Brown*, 121 Idaho 385, 393, 825 P.2d 482, 490 (1992). In evaluating the reasonableness of a sentence, we consider the nature of the offense and the character of the offender, applying our well-established standards of review. See *State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 170 P.3d 387 (2007).

Applying the foregoing standards and having reviewed the record, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion by imposing the sentences. Accordingly, Lawrence's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.